



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THOMAS RILEY MARSHALL

(From a speech by the editor of this REVIEW at the Waldorf-Astoria on May 8, 1913, replying to an address by the Vice-President, in which he attacked New York as a city of the rich and declared that the power of taxation should be used to reduce individual fortunes to a maximum of \$100,000.)

EVERY statesman who comes to this town nowadays from as far west as Rahway feels it to be not only his privilege, but his most distinct obligation, to "warn" New York. He calls it bearding the lion in his den. That is the way he invariably begins. It is a good way, too, because he thus avoids wounding the sensibilities of our traditional tiger and at the same time conveys to the folks at home a sense of his own dauntless spirit. He really has no need to manifest either courage or defiance. We never think of hurting such an one. We never even indicate disapproval of our own chastisement. We simply sit and listen, and when it is over we return placidly to our homes and yawn ourselves to sleep. In other words, we here have become so used to being reprimanded that scolding has become noticeable only by its absence.

And we never complain. What's the use? We know we are bad and we know that those who chide us and the communities from which they hail are good. Else, of course, they would not be so presumptuous as to mark the distinction to our faces. So we take our medicine in halls like this about twice a week, on the average, during the speaking season, and we ask no questions that we may hear no lies.

But what does the statesman from west of Rahway warn us about? Ah, gentlemen, that we never know. He does not tell. Mind you, he never threatens. Always he speaks in sorrow rather than in anger. Usually, being himself broadminded and worldly-wise, he disavows personal responsibility for his utterances. He merely reflects the opinions of others—the "great mass" of others who live at a distance and think loudly. He deprecates the tendency among his fellows. It gives him a pain. But there it is. It exists. And what can he as a patriot and a statesman do except to admonish us who are of the inferior flesh and not of the superior spirit?

Our latest monitory visitor was our worthy Vice-President. He had come almost directly from the place of his nativity, Columbus City, Indiana, which rests on the banks of the river Eel. His pur-

pose was to inaugurate a four-years' period of perfect silence. He did it admirably. The aching void was filled to overflowing. As a Democrat, I was proud. I had to be. We are in power. At least, some of us are. And the occurrence is sufficiently rare to make gratification obligatory. So it was some occasion. We were all from Missouri that night. We wanted to know. And we found out.

True, some of the things we learned were not entirely new. The fact, for example, that inheritances can be regulated by law was not startling as a discovery. We knew that,—long before the Wabash was christened, to say nothing of the river Eel. Why, it is not necessary to wait 'till a man dies to take his property. That can be done while he is living, with full sanction of law, too. There may be some question of principle or perhaps of morals involved, but there is no legal difficulty under our form of government. It is simply a matter of votes. So if we are going to inaugurate a policy of confiscation at all, or to suggest one in the guise of a warning, why not, in the trenchant language of the prairies, go the whole hog? Surely the proposal would be no less popular than Mr. Marshall declares his to be. And if there be nothing in usage sanctioned since the days of Solon, the proceeding would be equally unobjectionable. When you once admit that might makes right there is no end of opportunity.

Obviously to Mr. Marshall's mind there are but two distinct classes of humankind. One he depicts as the "thoughtless rich." The other presumably is the thoughtful poor. Patiently one inquires, What is the basis of the assumption that the successful are incapable of reason and that the unprosperous are full of wisdom? Whence spring tangible evidences? From intelligence and thrift or from obtuseness and sloth? Do attained results possess no meaning? Is achievement barren of credit? Does failure evolve philosophy? Are those whom Mr. Marshall describes as the "have nots" necessarily imbued by an inexorable law of Nature with a sagacity withheld from those who have that which they have earned or inherited? Mr. Marshall does not say. Possibly he has not thought.

What he does know is that the number of those who have large fortunes is much smaller than of those who have small fortunes or none at all. But there is nothing new in that. It always has been. It probably always will be. The question he raises is, How much ought one to be permitted to possess, or, rather, to bestow upon his descendants? All he can earn in the one case, all he has in the other, has been and still is the answer of ages of experiment and experience. But Mr. Marshall finds that this idea is now held only by backward or inward looking men. The great mass of those who wish to go forward, presumably into affluence, feel differently. Precisely where the line should be drawn he finds uncertain. But "seven men," not of the East, surely, but nevertheless men "of

judgment," with whom Mr. Marshall has conversed, are convinced that \$100,000 is the proper amount and Mr. Marshall seems to coincide, reluctantly, of course, but firmly.

But why \$100,000? Why not \$10,000? The number of those who are not able to bequeath \$10,000 is infinitely larger than of those who have more? Why, if we are willing to embark upon confiscation at all, should we restrict our activities? And would we if once started upon the road? Did this point, I wonder, arise in the minds of the seven men of judgment? And if so, could their opinion possibly have been made to conform to their means? Even Mr. Marshall will have to admit that, so long as natures continue to be human, there almost invariably comes a time of limit when one feels that the Golden Rule does not apply to his particular case. And it is then that he resorts to what Mr. Marshall designates as the reprehensible practice of employing a lawyer.

But what does Mr. Marshall want us six millions of thoughtless rich in New York to do? Wherein have we so erred of late as to deserve rebuke or require a warning? Were we in his view looking backward when we gave to him as a candidate a plurality of two hundred thousand? Was our legislature at fault when it approved a constitutional amendment providing for a federal income tax? Did that action, which imposes one-tenth of the entire burden directly upon the residents of the Empire State, evidence churlishness or avarice? Was New York out of step with what Mr. Marshall regards as progress when it declared for the election of United States Senators by popular vote? Surely in none of these things can he find occasion for rebuke.

Why, then, the warning? What is the iniquitous attitude or proceeding which Mr. Marshall views with such apprehension that he perceived the need and duty of official admonition? Unfortunately, we are obliged to make our own deductions because he submits no specifications. In a general way he seems to have concluded that the people of this community are opposing or are preparing to antagonize the policies of the Democratic dispensation. But how can that be when the representatives whom they sent to Congress are acting in perfect accord with the leaders of their party? Perhaps it is the tariff. Truly this is the greatest manufacturing city in the Union, and surely if any industries are imperiled by reduction in duties they are those of this vicinity. But where are the signs of opposition? Public journals are commonly recognized as the spokesmen of their communities. Can Mr. Marshall point to a single New York newspaper, Independent, Democratic, Progressive, or Republican, that is denouncing the Underwood bill? On the contrary, each and every one has insisted steadfastly since the day of election that the policy decreed by the people must be made effectual, and practically no adverse criticism has been passed upon the measure now pending. The sole comment has been the natural

one, "If 'twere done, 'twere well 'twere done quickly." Surely no exception can be taken to that.

You must admit, gentlemen, that even to those of us who pretend we should like to do what is right it is all very bewildering. But I think I have the solution. That is why I take care to refer to our recent guest as Mr. Marshall and not as the Vice-President. I doubt if he quite realizes yet that he has been elected. So, naturally, he keeps on campaigning. Then, too, I know Mr. Marshall and value the record he made as a level-headed, courageous Governor. The trouble with him seems to be that, like Mr. Bryan in former days, he must needs talk occasionally through a cocked hat. He is like what we used to call in New England a fine door-yard horse—one that prances up to the stoop in the greatest style imaginable and starts off with the highest of steps, but as soon as he turns the corner drops head and tail and settles down to a good steady gait.

So there is no need to worry. Experience, gentlemen, is quite as good a schoolmaster as a—well, as a Vice-President, anyway. And I am confident that it is only a question of time when Mr. Marshall will discover that the chief menace to our country today lies not so much in the activities of the predatory rich as in incitement of the predatory poor.

Do not suspect, gentlemen, that I am venturing to chide or even to reply to Mr. Marshall. I am only trying to indicate the causes which impelled somewhat injudicious remarks from a truly worthy man. We cherish no resentments here. We haven't the time. But we cannot accept his suggestion that we wear masks when we visit the East Side. That may be advisable on the part of a resident of Columbia City when he goes down to the banks of the river Eel after dark, but there is no such need in this vicinity. And instead of rebuking Mr. Marshall I would apologize to him. I fear he took away the impression that we did not catch the humor of his remark that the chief occupation of a Vice-President is to keep a sharp watch over the health of the President. But we did. We are not so dull as all that. We saw the joke. We didn't laugh because we could not feel certain, in view of Mr. Marshall's self-revelation, that it was a laughing matter. Indeed, I may go so far as to admit that, if somebody had proposed the health of Mr. Wilson at the conclusion of Mr. Marshall's speech, the toast would have been drunk with rare enthusiasm.